(4) (1)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION NO.2274/2006

SINGLE BENCH

PETITIONER:

Rajkumar Padey,
S/o Shri Ramkumar Padey,
Aged about 44 years,
Post –Assistant Statistical Officer,
Agriculture Department,
R/o Village Mungeli,
District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

R.R. No. 2309/06
Presented by Shri Alok Dewangan
dated 29/4/06

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS: :

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
Through the Secretary,
Ministry of Agriculture,
Agriculture Department,
D.K.S. Bhawan, Mantralaya
Raipur, C.G.

2. The Director,
Department of Agriculture,
Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

3. The Deputy Director,
Department of Agriculture,
District Bilaspur, C.G.

4. The Sub Divisional Agricultural
Officer, Mungeli, District
Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh.

RECEIVED-COPY
29/4/06
CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226/227 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUENCE OF WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBTION, CERTIORARI, AND ANY OTHER WRITS, DIRECTIONS OR ORDERS.

(33)

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE CHHATTISGARH : BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE SHRI SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION NO. 2274 OF 2006

Petitioner : Rajkumar Padey

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and others

Present : Shri Alok Dewangan, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri A.S. Kachhawaha, Government Advocate for the respondents/State.

ORAL ORDER

(3rd May, 2006)

1. The petitioner who was working as Assistant Statistical Officer, Grade-III in the office of the Sub Divisional Agricultural Officer, Mungeli, District Bilaspur was transferred to the office of the Sub Divisional Agricultural Officer, Bijapur, District Dantewada by order dated 24.4.2006 (Annexure P/1) in the interest of public and due to administrative exigency.

2. In transfer matters this Court while exercising its jurisdiction under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India has limited scope for interference. The High Court can interfere with the transfer order only in those cases, where order has been passed by an incompetent officer and/or contrary to the statutory rules or regulations or in exercise of malice. In the present case nothing has been shown, as stated above.

3. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed summarily.

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge

Bablu